CLEARY GOTTLIEB STEEN & HAMILTON LLP

ONE LIBERTY PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10006-1470
(212) 225-2000
FACSIMILE (212) 225-3999

WWW.CLEARYGOTTLIEB.COM

WASHINGTON, DC • PARIS • BRUSSELS • LONDON • MOSCOW FRANKFURT • COLOGNE • ROME • MILAN • HONG KONG BEIJING • BUENOS AIRES • SÃO PAULO • ABU DHABI • SEOUL

> Writer's Direct Dial: +1 (212) 225-2550 E-Mail: lliman@cgsh.com

LAURENT ALPERT
VICTOR I. LEWKOW
LESLIEN S. ISILVERMAN
ROBERT L. TORTORIELLO
LEE C. BUCHHEIT
JAMES M. PEASLEE
ALAN L. BELLER
THOMAS J. MOLENT
THOMAS J. MOLENT
THOMAS J. MOLENT
THOMAS J. MOLENT
ROBERT P. DAVIS
ROBERT P. DAVI

MICHAEL A. GERSTENZANG
LEWIS J. LIMAN
LEV L. DASSIN
NEIL Q. WHORISKEY
JORGE U. JUANTORENA
MICHAEL D. WEINBERGER
DAVID LEINWAND
JEFFREY A. WEINBERGER
DAVID LEINWAND
JEFFREY A. LOGSBERG
MICHAEL D. DAVAN
CARMINE D. BOCCUZZI, JR.
JEFFREY D. KARPF
KIMBERLY BROWN BLACKLOW
ROBERT J. RAYMOND
LEONARD C. JACOBY
SANDRA L. FLOSTERD
FRANCESCA. CODELL
WILLIAM L. MCTAEL
JASON FACTOR
MARGARET S. PEPONIS
LISA M. SCHWEITZER
JUAN G. GIRALDEZ
DUANE M. CALUCHLIN
BREON S. PEACTER
CHANTAL LE KORDULA
BENET J. OFEILLY
DAVID AMAN
ADAM E. FLEISHER
SEAN A. ONEAL
GLENN P. MEGRORY
MAITHEW P. SALERNO
MICHAEL J. LIBANO
MICHAEL J. LIBANO
MICHAEL J. ALBANO
MICHAEL J.

JENNIFER KENNEDY PARK
ELIZABETH LENAS
LUKE A. BARFEOOT
PAMELA L. MARCOGLESE
PAUL M. TIGE
JONATHAN S. KOLONER
RESIDENT PARTNERS

SANDRA M. ROCKS
S. DOUGLAS BORISKY
JUDITH KASSEL
DAVID E. WEBB
PENELOPE L. CHRISTOPHOROU
BOAZ S. MORAG
MARY E. ALCOK
DAVID H. HERRINGTON
HEIDE H. IEGENFRITZ
HUGH C. CONROY, JR
AVERME LENASON, JR.
WALAGE E. LARSON, JR.
AVERME LUETF
DANIEL ILAN
ANDREW WEAVER

LOUISE M. PARENT

February 19, 2015

VIA ECF

Hon. Andrew J. Peck, U.S.M.J. Southern District of New York Daniel Patrick Moynihan Courthouse 500 Pearl Street, Courtroom 20D New York, New York 10007

Re: Rio Tinto plc v. Vale S.A., et al., Civil Action No. 14-cv-3042 (RMB) (AJP) (S.D.N.Y.)

Dear Judge Peck:

Pursuant to the Court's order (Dk. 187), we write on behalf of defendant Vale S.A. ("Vale") in response to the letter filed by plaintiff Rio Tinto plc ("Rio Tinto"), dated February 18, 2015 (Dk. 184), which sought to compel production of the VBG Feasibility Study. As Plaintiff's counsel was well aware when it filed its letter, Vale was in the process of reviewing the eight-volume Feasibility Study to determine which portions were responsive to Plaintiff's document requests, as narrowed by this Court's orders (*see* Nov. 3, 2014 Tr. 42:10-12), and further to determine the appropriate treatment under the Protective Order. That process was completed this morning, and Vale will be producing the entire, unredacted Feasibility Study by early next week.

Careful review of the Feasibility Study was particularly important given the upcoming bidding process for Simandou Blocks 1 and 2 that the Guinean Government has announced will take place in the next few months. The VBG Feasibility Study, compiled at great expense to Vale, is the most recent and comprehensive study of the iron ore deposits at issue, and is obviously of great interest to Vale's competitor, Rio Tinto. Much of the information contained in the Study, although valuable and proprietary to Vale, is of no conceivable relevance to this

¹ Contrary to Plaintiff's suggestion, there is no equivalence between VBG's 2011 Feasibility Study (focused exclusively on Simandou Blocks 1 and 2, the subject of the upcoming bid) and Rio Tinto's 2008 pre-feasibility study (focused primarily on Simandou Blocks 3 and 4), the vast majority of which Plaintiff has conceded contains no information relevant to this case.

Case 1:14-cv-03042-RMB-AJP Document 188 Filed 02/19/15 Page 2 of 2

Hon. Andrew J. Peck, p. 2

case, and even less falls within the scope of the purportedly misappropriated information that Plaintiff has identified, and which Your Honor has ruled should limit discovery on that subject going forward. Nonetheless, Vale will produce the full Study, without prejudice to its position that much of the information is irrelevant – none of it was stolen from Rio Tinto – and that Plaintiff's misappropriation requests remain cabined by this Court's prior rulings.

Finally, it bears repeating that there was no emergency here. The existence of the VBG Feasibility Study has been a matter of public record since at least 2013.² Vale never hid its existence from Rio Tinto or anyone else, and in fact had agreed to produce it before Plaintiff's manufactured emergency was raised with the Court. In short, the issue is now moot, and could have been avoided if Rio Tinto had not chosen to present a mock "emergency" a few days before the parties' joint letter filing.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Lewis J. Liman Lewis J. Liman

2

² See, e.g., BSG Resources Limited: Beny Steinmetz and BSG Resources sue FTI Consulting LLP and Lord Malloch-Brown, Reuters, April 11, 2013, available at http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/04/11/bsg-resources-idUSnBw5gnGZ9a+10c+BSW20130411 ("the feasibility study for Blocks 1 and 2 were submitted in September 2011").